

N/A

| PERFORMANCE | | |
|-------------|--|--|

| | Absolute Rating | Improvement Rating | Adequate Yearly Progress |
|------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| 2001 | Good | Good | N/A |
| 2002 | Good | Unsatisfactory | N/A |
| 2003 | Good | Average | N/A |
| 2004 | | - | |

| TENTH GRADE PASSAGE OF ONE OR MORE SUBTESTS OF THE EXIT EXAM | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|------------|------|------|---|------|--|--|
| | | Our School | | | High Schools with Students Like Ours | | | |
| Percent | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | | |
| Passed all 3 subtests | 74.1 | 58.7 | 62.3 | 66.0 | 62.7 | 63.9 | | |
| Passed 2 subtests | 14.8 | 20.6 | 18.3 | 17.3 | 18.4 | 18.0 | | |
| Passed 1 subtest | 6.9 | 12.6 | 12.1 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 10.6 | | |
| Passed no subtests | 4.1 | 8.0 | 7.3 | 6.7 | 6.9 | 6.9 | | |

| | Exit Exam Passage Rate by Spring 2003 | | | Eligibility for LIFE Scholarships* | | Graduation Rate | |
|-------------------------------|--|------|-----|---------------------------------------|-----|-----------------|--|
| | n | % | n | % | n | % | |
| All Students | 264 | 96.2 | 237 | 11.8 | 312 | 65.4 | |
| Gender | | | | | | | |
| Male | 122 | 92.6 | 102 | 9.8 | 151 | 47.7 | |
| Female | 142 | 99.3 | 135 | 13.3 | 161 | 82.0 | |
| Race or Ethnic Group | | | | | | | |
| African American | 81 | 95.1 | 95 | 2.1 | 133 | 51.9 | |
| Hispanic | 4 | I/S | 2 | I/S | 3 | I/S | |
| White | 179 | 96.6 | 139 | 18.0 | 175 | 75.4 | |
| Other | N/A | N/A | 1 | I/S | 1 | I/S | |
| Disability Status | | | | | | | |
| Non-speech disabilities | 15 | 80.0 | 21 | 0.0 | 30 | 76.7 | |
| Students without disabilities | 249 | 97.2 | 216 | 13.0 | 282 | 64.2 | |
| Migrant Status | | | | | | | |
| Migrant | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | |
| Non-migrant | 264 | 96.2 | 237 | 11.8 | 0 | N/A | |
| English Proficiency | | | | | | | |
| Limited English proficient | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A | 3 | I/S | |
| Non-LEP | 264 | 96.2 | 237 | 11.8 | 309 | 66.0 | |
| Lunch Status | | | | | | | |
| Subsidized meals | 70 | 94.3 | 78 | 1.3 | 109 | 53.2 | |
| Full-pay meals | 194 | 96.9 | 159 | 17.0 | 203 | 71.9 | |

| Percent of | Our School | High Schools with Students Like Ours |
|---|------------|---|
| Seniors eligible for LIFE Scholarships at four-year institutions* | 11.8 | 10.4 |
| Seniors who met the SAT requirement | 11.8 | 10.7 |
| Seniors who met the grade point average | 54.4 | 50.0 |

^{*}Using only the SAT and grade point average requirements

| SCHOOL PROFILE | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| | OurSchool | Change from Last Year | High Schools with Students Like Ours | Median High School |
| Students (n= 1,592) | | | | |
| Retention rate | 12.7% | Down from 16.8% | 9.0% | 7.3% |
| Attendance rate | 95.2% | Up from 94.4% | 95.4% | 95.5% |
| Eligible for gifted and talented With disabilities other than speech | 0.0% 15.8% | Down from 9.9% Up from 14.0% | 4.2% 12.1% | 5.1% 12.2% |
| Older than usual for grade Suspended or expelled | 11.9% 2.5% | Down from 14.5% Down from 4.7% | 10.2% 2.5% | 10.1% 2.3% |
| Enrolled in AP/IB programs Successful on AP/IB exams | 9.6% N/A | N/A N/A | N/A N/A | 10.2% N/A |
| Annual dropout rate Career/technology students in co-curricular organizations | 2.0% 3.1% | Down from 3.8% Up from 3.0% | 2.7% 4.8% | 2.7% 3.2% |
| Enrollment in career/technology cente courses | r 1246 | Up from 1097 | 464 | 433 |
| Students participating in worked-based experiences | 26.4% | Up from 16.4% | 22.2% | 26.3% |
| Career/technology students mastering core competencies | 64.2% | Down from 67.1% | 76.9% | 74.9% |
| Career/technology completers placed | 100.0% | Up from 98.8% | 99.4% | 99.5% |
| Teachers (n= 93) | | | | |
| Teachers with advanced degrees | 48.4% | Down from 50.0% | 47.8% | 51.7% |
| Continuing contract teachers | 75.3% | Up from 73.0% | 80.0% | 81.8% |
| Highly qualified teachers Teachers returning from previous year | N/A 80.3% | N/A Down from 83.1% | N/A 86.0% | N/A 85.1% |
| Teacher attendance rate Average teacher salary | N/R \$39,140 | N/R Down 1.7% | 95.9% \$39,856 | 95.8% \$40,303 |
| Prof. development days/teacher | 11.3 days | Up from 10.6 days | 10.8 days | 10.3 days |
| School | | | | |
| Principal's years at school Student-teacher ratio | 5.0 29.6 to 1 | Up from 4.0 Up from 12.6 to 1 | 5.0 27.9 to 1 | 3.0 26.2 to 1 |
| Prime instructional time Dollars spent per pupil* | N/R \$5,798 | N/R Up 8.8% | 90.3% \$6,302 | 90.1% \$6,279 |
| Percent spent on teacher salaries* Opportunities in the arts | 57.1% Excellent | No change No change | 57.5% Excellent | 57.8% Excellent |
| Parents attending conferences | 99.0% | No change | 88.2% | 87.8% |
| SACS accreditation | yes | N/A | yes | yes |
| * Prior year audited financial data are reported. | | | | |

| Ahhraviations : | for Missing Data |
|-----------------|------------------|
| | |

Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools

Highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools

Our District

N/A

N/A

State

N/A

N/A

N/A Not Applicable N/C Not Collected N/R Not Reported I/S Insufficient Sample

REPORT OF PRINCIPAL AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL

The 2002-2003 school year was very successful for students and faculty at Laurens District 55 High School. Student achievement continued to be the top priority for the year. The graduating class earned in excess of one-half million dollars in college scholarships. Also, twenty-five percent of the seniors scored at least 1000 on the SAT.

Results of the 2003 Exit Exam showed improvement in Mathematics scores for LDHS sophomores, as 77.7% of students tested scored above standard, compared to 73.7% in 2002. Reading scores dipped slightly to 75.8 in 2003 from 76.1 in 2002, a change that is statistically insignificant, especially in light of the fact that 355 students were tested in 2003, compared to 285 students in 2002.

Faculty members were involved in meaningful staff development throughout the year as all teachers were trained in using Thinking Maps-tools that will improve student achievement. A writing committee was formed to study writing throughout all curricular areas and to train teachers on effective student writing. Science teacher and athletic trainer Leanne lacuone, one of many outstanding teachers, was named Teacher of the Year for the school and district.

Tara A. Dean, Principal

| EVALUATIONS BY TEACHERS, STUDENTS, AND PARENTS | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Teachers | Students | Parents | | | | |
| Number of surveys returned | 91 | 210 | 77 | | | | |
| Percent satisfied with learning environment | 75.0% | 49.0% | 61.8% | | | | |
| Percent satisfied with social and physical environment | 76.4% | 61.1% | 37.7% | | | | |
| Percent satisfied with home-school relations | 44.9% | 69.7% | 46.8% | | | | |

DEFINITIONS OF SCHOOL RATING TERMS

- Excellent School performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Good School performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Average School performance meets the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Below Average School is in jeopardy of not meeting the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Unsatisfactory School performance fails to meet the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal

DEFINITION OF ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

As required by the United States Department of Education, adequate yearly progress specified that the statewide target is met for all students and for each subgroup of students: racial/ethnic, economic, disability, limited English proficiency and migrant status.